

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 301

EA 019 950

AUTHOR Haggerson, Nelson
TITLE Clinical Supervision and Teacher Evaluation: Positions of Hunter, Garman and Glickman Interpreted as Literal or Figurative Language.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 33p.; Revision of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Discourse Analysis; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Utilization; *Figurative Language; Models; Reader Response; Semiotics; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

During a 1985 symposium in Chicago sponsored by the American Society for Curriculum Development, Noreen Garman, Carl Glickman, and Madeline Hunter discussed the question of whether clinical supervision should be used for formal evaluation and contract renewal. While Hunter's answer was a qualified "yes," Garman and Glickman both felt strongly that it should not. Nevertheless, evaluation of teachers in schools is often tied to the "Hunter Model," even though Hunter expressed reservations regarding such use. Inquiring why this is so, this paper argues that the language used by proponents of clinical supervision implies a form of evaluation that is generated to judge the outcomes of the process, regardless of the original intent of these proponents. A second proposition discussed is that if the language used to describe a "model," "strategy," or "practice" is literal, it implies a literal evaluation process, whereas if it is figurative, it implies a figurative process. The third proposition is that in a society caught up in rapid technological change, with a need for fast answers and definitive directions, those responsible for evaluation of instruction naturally tend to develop and use literal, not figurative or imaginative, evaluation instruments and practices. These propositions are investigated through analysis of the use of literal or figurative language in the text of the Hunter, Garman, and Glickman symposium. Findings are that Hunter's model of clinical supervision is based on literal language, Garman's is based on figurative language, and Glickman's is based on both, but predominantly figurative. But in a country possessed with the need for literal accountability of their teachers and schools, Hunter's language has naturally come to predominate. (TE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED294301

CLINICAL SUPERVISION AND TEACHER EVALUATION:
POSITIONS OF HUNTER, CARMAN AND GLICKMAN
INTERPRETED AS LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

A REVISED VERSION OF
A PAPER PRESENTED AT
AERA (32.13) IN WASHINGTON D.C.

APRIL 26. 1987

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

□ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Haggerson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Nelson Haggerson, Arizona State University

EA019950

CLINICAL SUPERVISION AS EVALUATION: POSITIONS OF
HUNTER, GARMAN AND GLICKMAN INTERPRETED
AS LITERAL OR FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE

INTRODUCTION

"Conflicting Conceptions of Clinical Supervision and the Enhancement of Professional Growth and Renewal: Point and Counterpoint" which appeared in the Winter, 1987 issue of the Journal of Curriculum and Supervision (p. 152) contained my first scholarly effort of interpreting the positions on clinical supervision of Hunter, Garman and Glickman. In that article I used the tapescript from a symposium at the 1985 ASCD Conference in Chicago in which Hunter, Garman and Glickman addressed critical questions regarding their positions on clinical supervision. I did a content analysis of the text of their remarks and then interpreted their positions from both philosophic and application points of view. I determined that Hunter comes to clinical supervision from a scientific-realist philosophic position, Garman from a phenomenologist position, and Glickman from an instrumentalist position. Furthermore, I concluded that for Hunter clinical supervision is a "model" to be used for improving instruction for all the teachers in the school; for Garman clinical supervision is a "practice" the desired outcome of which is the empowerment of individual teachers and supervisors; for Glickman clinical supervision is a tool or strategy used to

help the teacher in the developmental process with an ultimate goal of school-wide improvement.

One of the critical questions raised in that symposium was, "Should clinical supervision be used for formal evaluation and contract renewal?" For Hunter the answer was a qualified yes, "...the supervisor uses clinical supervision as a foundation for having a sampling of the teacher's performance on which to make an overall evaluation." Garman's answer was "no...it would be considered clinical evaluation." Glickman answered, "No, I don't think clinical supervision should be used for evaluation." But the question remains in the minds of many and we see the abuses of the positions proposed by these three in school after school; that is we see clinical supervision used as evaluation OF TEACHERS and as a basis of job renewal, often without any reservations. Returning to the answers given by Hunter, Garman and Glickman in the 1985 ASCD Symposium, I asked myself, "Why, then, is evaluation of teachers in the schools so often tied to the "Hunter Model" even though Hunter has expressed reservations regarding such use. I looked at the articles, listened to the discussions, and pondered the relationships. I then returned to an article I had written for the Illinois School Research and Development journal in 1985 (Haggerson) and found the basis of the present round of interpretation of the text of the Hunter, Garman, Glickman symposium regarding clinical supervision as evaluation.

In that article entitled, "Curriculum as Figurative Language: Exalting Teaching and Learning Through Poetry," I used Lakoff's and Johnson's (1980) meanings of "figurative" and "literal" language as the basis for positing two distinctly different approaches to teaching with attendant implications for curriculum development and supervision. The figurative and literal meanings of curriculum and instructional language implied very different ways of evaluating the outcomes of teaching. As I reviewed that article it occurred to me that the very language used by the proponents of clinical supervision might, indeed, "drive" a form of evaluation irrespective of the declared intentions of the three proponents being considered here. Furthermore, as I thought about the hermeneutic process of interpreting texts, I realized that Palmer's (1969) notion of the "intentional fallacy" might hold for "models," "strategies," and "practices" as well as other texts or art forms. The "intentional fallacy" means that once a piece has been created it has a life of its own, irrespective of the intentions of its author. Now when I put both the literal and figurative language and the "intentional fallacy" notions together I come up with several propositions to be checked out. One proposition is that the nature of the language of a particular text, "model," "tool or strategy," or "practice" implies the form of evaluation which is generated to judge the outcomes of the process, in this case clinical supervision. A second proposition is that if the language used to explicate,

explain, describe...a "model," "strategy," or "practice" is literal it implies a literal evaluation process, whereas if the language is figurative it implies a figurative process. The third proposition is that in a society caught up in technology, need for fast answers, definitive directions...those responsible for evaluation of instruction will develop and use literal, not figurative or imaginative, evaluation instruments and processes.

A first step in checking the verite of these propositions is to analyze the text of the symposium to determine if there is a proclivity of Hunter, Garman and Glickman for using literal or figurative language in explicating their positions. If I find that proclivity, then it will give a basis for further inquiry into the relationship between the language of clinical supervision and what educators do with clinical supervision as it relates to evaluation and perhaps why they select one conception of clinical supervision over another.

For this round of interpretation "clinical supervision as literal language" assumes a fixed reality, appropriate behaviors for all, a knowledge of reality that allows for precise preplanning and appropriate interpretations. Furthermore, it assumes measurable outcomes, leads to prediction and gives a basis for accountability in a predetermined way. On the other hand, "clinical supervision as figurative language" implies comparisons and contrasts, multiple meanings, multiple interpretations and expressive

objectives as well as multiple forms of evaluation. Figurative language is imaginative language.

Now I will look at the language with which each Hunter, Garman and Glickman address the questions asked at the symposium and see whether they are primarily literal, figurative or both literal and figurative.

LITERAL AND FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE USED IN
VERSIONS OF CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Stated Background and Orientation.

Hunter, Garman and Glickman volunteered information about how they were introduced to clinical supervision through their answers to the first question. Their backgrounds seemed important to their versions of clinical supervision. Hunter was first a psychologist and then an administrator who supervised teachers. She said, "I had never heard of any of the people writing about clinical supervision because I was born and bred in psychology, not in education." Garman, on the other hand, began her career as a high school English teacher in Cleveland and Pittsburgh. She later worked with teachers and master teachers in the University of Pittsburgh's Master of Arts in Teaching Program. She became a teacher educator and a "student of clinical supervision" studying with Morris Cogen. Speaking of her introduction into clinical supervision Garman said, "I considered supervision, in those early years, to be a 'common sense' enterprise. Anyone who was a good teacher could surely be a good supervisor by doing it. It was quite a shock to learn otherwise." Glickman, coincidentally, was a junior high school student at Newton, Mass. When early work in clinical supervision was being done there through the Harvard MAT Program, and later a supervising principal in New Hampshire, having been certified through a counseling and child development route. According to Glickman, "That background gave me a perspective on clinical supervision which

focused on how human beings grow and change. My perspective is different to the extent that I am not a proponent of clinical supervision as it is often described."

Conceptual version of clinical supervision: How do you construe your version of clinical supervision?

Hunter: Over the years I have become formalized in our UCLA version of clinical supervision...(Through observation) supervision captures, usually in a script tape, a written anecdotal record--the temporal relationship of what the teacher is doing with what the students are doing. Our model of clinical supervision requires no more than 15-20 minutes of observation to collect data...(Through analysis) the supervisor analyzes that record to look for cause-effect relationships, particularly trends in teaching...In our version you interpret what happens to the teacher, selecting out patterns or trends which, in your opinion, are enhancing the teacher's growth. You are looking for three kinds of things: behavior of the teacher that has a high probability of enabling learning...behavior of the teacher that has probability of producing no learning...and behavior which has high probability of interfering with student learning...As a result of your analysis, you determine the objectives of your conference with the teacher: to enhance the teacher's peaks, to bring up the teacher's valleys or to discard an irrelevant or non-productive behavior.

Interpretation. Hunter's "formalized" model includes an observation of the teacher by the supervisor, and analysis of the observation to determine cause-effect pedagogy and a conference which has three objectives, enhancing peaks, bringing up valleys, and discarding non-productive behavior. She emphasizes a direct administrative style in addressing the teacher. The supervisor seems to take charge of the events of supervision and informs the teacher, albeit she indicates that the teacher can determine which of the objectives she/he wants to emphasize.

Hunter's model of clinical supervision seems to reside in behavioral psychology with particular emphasis on the notion of cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning. Her descriptions and discussions are based primarily on literal use of language. "Over the years I have become formalized in our UCLA version of clinical supervision...Our model of clinical supervision requires no more than 15-20 minutes of observation to collect data...You are looking for three kinds of things: behavior of the teacher has a high probability of enabling learning...behavior of the teacher that has probability of producing no learning...and behavior which has high probability of interfering with student learning...As a result of your analysis, you determine the objectives of your conference with the teacher: to enhance the teacher's peaks, to bring up the teacher's valleys or to discard an irrelevant or non-productive behavior." The language in her quotes assumes a fixed reality, that is the

assumption underlying the cause-effect relationships, it allows for precise preplanning, it assumes measureable outcomes, and it gives a basis for accountability in a predetermined way. There is little, if any, figurative language as it pertains to the clinical supervision process she describes.

Garman: ...in the 1982 ASCD Yearbook I took the existing works that were in the field and the roots of clinical supervision (Cogan and Goldhammer) and attempted to discern the major concepts...I argue that from these concepts a supervisor could derive "practice." A clinical supervision conceptual framework (includes): Collegiality, Collaboration, Skilled Service (and) Ethical Conduct..

There are two important aspects...first, the nature of the people working together in a supervisors relationship...and second, there is a special service performed in that alliance...there is a spirit that people are working together with genuine intent and reciprocity for a prolonged period of time...the supervisor has particular skills of inquiry and theorizing about practice...the supervisor becomes part of the classroom life to work with the teacher to construct useful knowledge about the events of the classroom. Clinical supervision has been called a tool, technology, model...I think of it as a practice.

Interpretation. Garman rejects the notion that clinical supervision is a "model" to be applied by the supervisor, but rather construes clinical supervision as a practice with concepts which can guide the practitioner's actions. Her clinical supervision approach is inquiry oriented, there being no clear "model" of teaching that directs the supervisor's judgment. Effective teacher behaviors are determined within the context of classroom dynamics through collaborative inquiry, a case-study-like approach to understanding good practice.

Garman's psychological/philosophical orientation is phenomenological. The assumptions about knowing are around constructing knowledge, not discovering or applying it, and are based upon the phenomenological fields of the supervisor and the teacher as they collaborate with one another. The ethical conduct of both supervisor and teacher is based on the assumption of collegiality, not hierarchy. Cause-effect relationships are not sought, or, as a matter of fact, thought of as feasible except in temporary form. Garman's own term for her version of clinical supervision was "interactionist." That may be a meaningful term for others who interpret her work, too. The language she uses to explicate her position is almost completely figurative. It implies comparisons and contrasts, multiple meanings, multiple interpretations and expressive objectives as well as multiple forms of evaluation. Her language leaves much to the imagination of the teacher, the

supervisor and to the outcomes of their interactions.

Glickman: ...clinical supervision...or direct assistance to the teacher has to be done in relationship to other tasks in the school...I view clinical supervision as a five step structure that a supervisor can use to identify the common level of teacher thinking about classroom practice...I think that the idea that we can train people in pre-observation, observation, analysis and critique in post-conferencing and then suppose that they can...do all of those cycles with every teacher and make a big difference in the structure of the school is misleading...there is not a single study that shows that clinical supervision, by itself, is a direct, causal link to the improvement of classroom instruction...by itself it does not make for school-wide improvement.

I advocate...developmental supervision...directive collaborative and non-directive collaborative...these approaches are matched according to the current structure of teacher thought to provide an instructional improvement plan. A directive approach is best used with teachers...who have concrete thinking about their own instructional change...a collaborative approach is best used with teachers of moderate abstraction...the non-directive approach is best used with teachers who are highly abstract in thinking about instructional change.

Interpretation. Glickman considers clinical supervision as a tool and one that is too narrow for school-wide efforts in improvement and staff development. He characterizes clinical supervision as a five step structure that can help individual teachers in a limited way. He extends his own thinking and practice to include a developmental approach to supervision, advocating that supervisory style be matched with learning styles; e.g. a direct supervision approach matches a concrete learning style, a collaborative supervision approach matches a moderate abstract learning style, and a nondirective supervision approach matches a highly abstract learning style. Glickman's construal of supervision is related to school improvement efforts at the institutional level, rather than at the individual level.

Glickman's construal of supervision has its psychological base in developmental psychology where emphases are on stages of learner development which call for appropriate attendant supervisory approaches. Philosophically, his words indicate an instrumentalist orientation in which he uses clinical supervision or whatever structure or strategy as an instrument to attain a goal. The goal most often stated is school-wide improvement. He assumes the nature of the learner is that described in developmental psychology. His language is both literal and figurative. It is literal when he describes clinical supervision as a five step process, it is figurative when he speaks about non-directive collaborative approaches. Glickman's language is literal when he discusses a "directive

approach...for...teachers who have concrete thinking about their own change..." His language is figurative when he postulates about the interrelationships between the use of clinical supervision and developmental psychology. While Glickman's use of literal and figurative language is mixed, there are sufficient ambiguities, contrasts, and comparisons that I sense his version of clinical supervision "drives" or implies a figurative evaluation model, at least for the big picture of teaching and improving instruction. Literal aspects seem to call most for short-range translations.

The conflicting conceptions of clinical supervision as espoused by Hunter, Garman and Glickman, to the present, might be characterized as: a model (Hunter), a practice (Garman), and a tool or strategy (Glickman). Hunter's language is literal, Garman's is figurative and Glickman's is both.

The Mission of Clinical Supervision: What Do You Propose is the Overall Mission of Clinical Supervision?

Hunter: The overall mission of clinical supervision is to increase instructional excellence...We know that to increase excellence you need to know what you're doing well, what you're doing that is not as good as it could be and what is necessary in order to improve.

Interpretation. In our most common parlance Hunter's version of the mission of clinical supervision is to improve instruction, to make it excellent. She would have the

supervisor help the teacher discern the cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning and then "coach" the teacher to apply those principles. Her words and actions seem to indicate that she views her model of clinical supervision as a way to improve instruction not just on an individual basis, but on a school-wide, district-wide, state-wide, even a nation-wide basis. Irrespective of Hunter's stated intentions regarding the use of her version of clinical supervision, her literal language calls out to be used as part of evaluation in the schools where accountability for literal aspects of knowledge and behavioral outcomes are dominant.

Garman: I think clinical supervision is concerned with the teacher's professional progress and the learning of students...I believe personal empowerment is the essential ingredient in the mission of clinical supervision. Without this feeling of responsibility for the profession and a sense of empowerment to make a difference, the educator becomes a kind of civil servant in a larger community.

Interpretation. Garman focuses on "personal empowerment" as the major concept of the mission of clinical supervision. There is nothing in Garman's words or actions which indicates that she see's school-wide improvement of instruction as the mission of clinical supervision. As a matter of fact her version of clinical supervision as a means of personal empowerment puts her close to the position of Goldhammer who

envisioned clinical supervision as contributing to the psychological enhancement of individual teachers. When viewed in this way, the profound difference between Garman's and Hunter's views of the mission of clinical supervision are clear. That no prescribed form for evaluation comes from Garman's position and her figurative language is obvious.

Rather, the form of evaluation that seems to be implied is a long-range, individualized one, and the ultimate evaluation regarding the empowerment of the teacher would have to be made by the teacher, not the supervisor. The nature of empowerment is so complicated and long-ranged that any evaluation instrument designed to give immediate feedback would be difficult, if not impossible to construct. Furthermore, to think of being able to gather enough data in 15-20 minutes to assist in the evaluation process is ludicrous in Garman's frame of reference.

Glickman: The overall mission of clinical supervision...is to assist teachers to become more reflective about what they do...I am concerned about the structure of a teacher's thinking about his/her classroom...I believe the way we promote teachers' thought is not by treating people all the same, in supervising them all the same way. Some teachers can be assisted in their thinking by the supervisor providing more information and making more suggestions about what can be done. There are some teachers who could be

assisted more by simply actively listening and clarifying and probing...so the framework I use identifies the structure of thought first and then establishes the initial entry point in working with the teacher.

Interpretation. Glickman's instrumentalist philosophy is evident here as he discusses the mission of clinical supervision. Clearly, his view of mission is, if clinical supervision helps the teacher in the developmental process, then use it. If it takes another strategy or tool, then use that. Glickman's language in this section is mainly figurative. It calls for teachers to become more reflective, "I believe the way we promote teachers' thought is not by treating people all the same, in supervising them all the same way...There are some teachers who could be assisted more by simply actively listening and clarifying and probing..." Glickman's language explicating the overall mission of clinical supervision, while elaborating different goals from Garman, is figurative and implies long-term and complex forms of evaluation.

Theory or Research Base for Clinical Supervision: What Is the Theory or Research Base for Your Version of Clinical Supervision?

Hunter: The research base for clinical supervision began with Thorndike who showed that practice in itself

without knowledge of results of what was right and what was wrong and how to fix it, did not improve performance...12 years ago...(through) Project Linkage...we demonstrated that...with in-service for teachers and clinical supervision student learning as measured by test results was doubled to quadrupled...Stallings study results are showing dramatic results...in-service plus coaching seem to show significant effects.

Interpretation. Analysis of Hunter's words in this section makes her notion of "coaching" clear. Coaching is helping one practice what is known to be appropriate; it is application of cause-effect relationships. When one takes a position of cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning, it is easy, albeit risky, to make the next inferential jump, that is, there is a cause-effect relationship between clinical supervision and improvement of instruction on a district-wide basis. Whether or not Hunter intends to make that jump, her reference to "Stallings' study...showing dramatic results" gives the reader or listener the impression that she does. Her literal language is in keeping with the notion of the "correspondence theory" of knowledge, the truth test of which is how nearly our perceptions and conceptions of reality correspond to "reality." What better definition of literal!

Garman:...three ways to think about research and theory generating in relation to clinical

supervision...(are) formal theories, grounded theories...and research used in the name of science for the purpose of creating educational doctrine to make it legitimate. The original research done by Cogen and Goldhammer was done in a grounded theory way. They didn't empirically invent clinical supervision...they discovered the critical actions through careful observations, case studies and eventually built, what Glaser and Strauss call, substantive theories about clinical supervision. Their process was inquiry itself, rather than a five step model...As professionals we have in our intellectual knowledge base concepts, principles, findings...from several fields...these are the wellsprings from which we resonate as we continue to inquire as part of our professional practice.

Interpretation. Garman attributes the original theory of clinical supervision to Cogen and Goldhammer in generating substantive theories from their Harvard experiences. Supervisory practice, which is Garman's thrust, is thus derived from the inquiry approach which formed the basis of the early work. She contrasts three points of view regarding research: research as generating formal theory to shape "models of practice," research as continual inquiry generating theories grounded in the base of individual practice, and research used to legitimate educational doctrine.

Garman's notion of research is that it is "process-oriented" not product oriented. Clinical supervision for her

is collaborative inquiry, the result of which is empowerment of both the supervisor and teacher. The language of grounded theory, to which Garman refers, is figurative language, albeit the "constant comparative analysis" of data gives a rigor to grounded theory research. The research basis out of which Garman's language and position regarding clinical supervision derives is figurative, calls for holistic, long-term and multiple forms of evaluation.

Glickman: My theory base comes from a cognitive developmental perspective. I use Piaget, Bruner and Kohlberg. I use the research of adult ego and concept development of Levinger and Hunt, the adult learning of Horne and Cattell, the teacher concern research of Fuller and Hall and the teacher cognition research of Harvey, Hunt, Joyce, et. al.

Direct research on my theory...is still in its infancy...(in) five studies conducted relating to the theory, three of them found no relationship between teacher conceptual thought and preferred delivery of supervision...one recent study did find a relationship of teacher cognition with in-service...similar studies are being conducted...As a researcher I don't think that research on my theory will ever prove anything other than it works in some situations and not in others...What gives more credence are the reports from people who are using the model and telling me what is

happening with it...that using a developmental perspective for working with individual teachers and groups of teachers is helpful in implementing school-wide change.

Interpretation. While Glickman states his theory base to be that of cognitive development, his research base is that of an instrumentalist. That is he talks of studies which are situational and he uses various sources of data, including "testimony of practitioners" who say his approach works for them in their setting. Glickman is realistic in not overstating the case for any study or approach to research. He also cautions that the studies claiming success for clinical supervision as seen in the results of student achievement are limited to reading and mathematics. While Glickman's goal for supervision is school-wide improvement and his broad theoretical base is cognitive development, his words constantly manifest his instrumentalist orientation toward research and clinical supervision and are, again in this section, figurative in meaning.

Classroom Observation and Conference: What Are the General Purposes of These Events and How Do You Interpret Them?

Hunter:...the primary purpose of classroom observation is the collection of data where temporal relationships are established from which can be extracted highly probable cause-effect relationships...I

see the collection of data...through a tape script to be relatively routine. Where I see the educational situation emerging is in the conference where the supervisor may set the goal, the teacher may set the goal or you may collaboratively set the goal...there is a fourth purpose of the conference and that is to identify things that did not go well and suggest ways to do them differently...the job of the supervisor is not to clone herself, but to enable the teacher to remediate something that was disappointing in the lesson. I think there is an area which most people are not addressing when they say, "He is a marvelous teacher. Why should I do anything with him?" You conference with him because without some "dialectical impulses" coming into the teacher he will not continue to grow."

Interpretation. Hunter sees observation as a "fairly routine" time to collect script data. The conference is the place where the supervisor is able to enhance what the teacher does well and identify things that did not go well, suggesting ways to improve. She emphasizes remediation as an important part of the conference and suggests that even good teachers can be prodded to do better. If they don't get the stimulation they will not continue to grow. The criteria, both implicit and explicit, for growth and improvement are the cause-effect relationships between teaching and learning which are taken from a particular form of psychological research. In this

section Hunter uses some figurative language such as "collaborative," "disappointing" and "dialectical impulses," however, the tone and sense of the passage is literal.

Garman: ...in the classic Cogen tradition, observation is really a time to get as careful a record of events without imposing predetermined categories on the emerging data. The concept of "stable data" (Garman's research) is the basis for analysis of the lesson. Patterns and categories depicting the meaning of events emerge from the inductive analysis when done by the supervisor and the teacher.

There are two basic problems with the supervisory conference...first it generally suffers from the ritualistic nature as part of the school culture...and second, in the literature of supervision as well as in school practice, the conference is vastly over-rated as an educational event...we have put too much educative stock in the conference...we have to go far beyond the ritualistic conference. The conference can be a place to document the class events in such a way that a formal or informal plan for further professional development can be made for activities beyond the conference. It is what follows the conference as the supervisor and teacher work together in earnest that matters most.

Interpretation. Garman emphasizes the collection of "stable data" as the primary purpose of the observation,

getting as careful a record of events as possible in order for the teacher and supervisor to use the data in an inductive analysis. As contrasted to Hunter's "looking for temporal relationships," Garman sees the "stable data" gathered as the basis for establishing relationships. It is a constructive (of relationships) orientation as contrasted to Hunter's discovery orientation.

Garman's version of the supervisory conference is radically different from much of current thinking in supervision. She views the typical conference as ritualistic and naive. Rather, she advocates other forms of meetings, work sessions, saying "it's what follows the conference...that matters most." These views of both observation and conference are in keeping with Garman's view of the mission of clinical supervision being to empower the teacher. While "stable data" might be considered literal language, when put in context of the meanings of the passage it does not have a literal meaning; stable data merely provide a constant base from which to make interpretations.

It is clear that those who see school-wide improvement, in a hurry, as the mission of and desired outcome of clinical supervision will find Garman's version lacking. On the other hand those, who believe that the professionalization of teaching has not been done through school-wide or nation-wide efforts at reform and that it ultimately must rest on the empowerment of teachers, will find Garman's version of clinical supervision appealing.

Glickman: (I think that)...a pre-conference should result in objectives and a focus for the classroom observation, and that the observation instrument should be determined by the objectives that the supervisor and the teacher have agreed on in the pre-conference...the instrument should not drive the objectives in an observation as it often does.

...the result of every post-conference should be something tangible in terms of what supervisor and teacher have agreed will be helpful for the future...one point regarding the post-conference (is that) the sharing of the description of what goes on in the classroom should always come before sharing any interpretations. Sharing descriptions prove helpful in making plans for change...sharing interpretations before or without descriptions leads to defensiveness and is not helpful.

Interpretation. Glickman's call for a pre-conference brings to focus an issue that neither of the other two participants have discussed, that is the observation instrument as possibly being something other than a tape script or that on which you record stable data. His emphasis in giving descriptive data to the teacher is in agreement with Hunter and Garman, and both are literal language. Put in context to the meanings of the passage, however the literal language of description is explicated in a setting of figurative language.

Short Answer Questions and Interpretations

Pre-conference: Should there be a pre-conference? Hunter's "no" is in keeping with her "model" in which the objectives of the observation and conference are already determined...a pre-conference is not only unnecessary, it is a waste of time. Garman's "for the most part I would advise a meeting of the minds before a formal visit" is consistent with her notions regarding collaboration and collegiality. Glickman's "yes, yes, no and yes" answer means it depends on the situation. The actual answers to this question are not as meaningful to the overall consistency of the respective versions of clinical supervision as are the reasons for the answers. The reasons given by each is consistent with the rest of their version and language of clinical supervision.

Announced observation: Is the supervisor obligated to announce to the teacher his or her intention to observe the class? For Hunter this is not an important question; she answers by saying, "I would leave it up to the teacher." Garman, on the other hand deems it an essential question and answers "absolutely yes." Garman sees this issue as an ethical one, the criterion being mutual agreement or collaboration. Glickman says, "It depends." It depends on the situation, on the lines of authority on line/staff responsibilities. "It depends" is consistent with the instrumentalist orientation implied by Glickman throughout. Garman's literal "absolutely yes," refers to the protection of a teacher's rights. It

would seem that her literal language has to do with ethical concerns and principles of human rights, only tangentially with the process of clinical supervision. On the other hand Hunter and Glickman, in this case, both use figurative language. To feret out these differences would demand texts where the emphases are on the domain of ethics, not the process, model or strategy of clinical supervision.

Clinical supervision as evaluation and contract renewal: Should clinical supervision be used for formal evaluation and contract renewal? Hunter's answer is a qualified yes, "...the supervisor uses clinical supervision as a foundation for having a sampling of the teacher's performance on which to make an overall evaluation." Garman's answer, as you would expect, is "no...it would be considered clinical evaluation. There is a difference between clinical supervision and clinical evaluation. We often confuse the two." Glickman would use another tool for evaluation, a tool designed for evaluation as indicated by his, "No, I don't think clinical supervision should be used for evaluation."

CONCLUSIONS

It was the answers to this question in contrast to the practices in the schools which led me to explore the nature of the language used to explicate the processes of clinical supervision. Since their intentions, as depicted in their words above, are none to make clinical supervision, itself, a form of evaluation, and yet the practice in the schools is just that, what is it in the positions these three authors take on clinical supervision that "drive" a model of evaluation of teachers in the schools. A society looking for a literal way to account for teacher behavior will find a source of accountability in a literally explicated model of supervision.

What we have established in these pages is that Hunter's model of clinical supervision is based on literal language, Garman's practice of clinical supervision is based on figurative language, and Glickman's model, while based on both literal and figurative, is predominantly figurative. Hence, we can make the inference that one reason for so many of the evaluation procedures, instruments and practices used now in the schools are associated with Hunter's model of clinical supervision, is that literal language in her model "drives" the literal evaluation procedures now being used. On the other hand explanations of clinical supervision that are based on figurative language don't lend themselves to "driving" any kind of evaluation, much less literal, short-term evaluations. We don't hear many evaluators referring to even Morris Cogen's

type of clinical supervision as a basis for their evaluations of teachers, to say nothing of Garman's version of clinical supervision which now varies considerably from the Cogen version. Glickman may hear testimonies about the efficacy of his practices and theories, but they are not the "rage" of the country. In a country possessed with the need for literal accountability of their teachers and schools neither Glickman's nor Garman's language dominate, as does Hunter's.

A remaining question which derives from the discussion of the history of clinical supervision is, who has ownership of a given version and what responsibility does the owner have? If we could agree that it is important to recognize that Cogen, Goldhammer and Anderson were the originators of clinical supervision in this century, would we allow Madeline Hunter, who did not study any of their original works, to use the term "clinical supervision" to name what she does that is very different from what they meant by clinical supervision? When we see a principal walk, unannounced, into a classroom with a "checklist" and say to a teacher, "I am using the Madeline Hunter checklist to evaluate you for tenure," what do we do? Does Madeline Hunter have any responsibility for the misuse of her model? Does Noreen Garman, who studied under Morris Cogen et. al. have any responsibility for continuing clinical supervision as they envisioned it? Does Glickman have some responsibility to a school district misusing his version of clinical supervision? My answer to that question is that once a position (text) is made public, the

"intentional fallacy," is operative. That is the intentions of the authors mean little in what happens to the text. (This may be one basis for explaining why Hunter is so active in inservicing teachers around the country and world; that is to help insure that her intentions do make a difference. There are no doubt other reasons, too.) The second part of the answer is that the nature of the language used to write the public version does effect the consequences of the text (versions of clinical supervision). In the case of the Hunter model explicated in literal terms, the consequences are evaluation models in literal terms, and those are the models sought by many administrators in the public schools today. Garman's version of clinical supervision described as practice and in figurative terms, and Glickman's version of clinical supervision interpreted as instrumental, described in both literal and figurative terms, are not providing what the bulk of those responsible for evaluation of teachers in our schools today seem to want or to be using.

In this paper I have attempted to enlighten our understanding of the possible relationships between the literal or figurative language used by proponents of certain versions of clinical supervision and teacher evaluation, the accountability needs of administrators in evaluating teachers and literal and figurative language, and roles and responsibilities of those who write about clinical supervision to teacher evaluation. These relationships are not clear-cut, linear...they are not totally explicable. There is, however, a

verity, a ring of the truth, in the arguments that the use of literal and/or figurative language by those whose texts were examined relate closely to the extent to which clinical supervision is considered in evaluating teachers.

Personally, I am concerned about the rush to a literal language approach to both clinical supervision and teacher evaluation. Our proclivity to declare "one" model or way of doing something has, in my opinion taken us on a spin of evaluating teachers "by the numbers," which may have dire consequences in the long run. We are, I am afraid, missing the richness and profound value of a figurative language approach to clinical supervision and teacher evaluation.

References

- Garman, N., Glickman, C., Hunter, M., and Haggerson, N. (1987) Conflicting conceptions of clinical supervision and the enhancement of professional growth and renewal: Point and counterpoint. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, Winter, 2:2.
- Haggerson, N. (1985) Curriculum and figurative language: Exalting teaching and learning through poetry. Illinois School Research and Development, Fall, 22:1.
- Lakoff, George and Johnson, Mark. (1980) Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Palmer, R. (1969) Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.